



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,562	05/10/2001	David M. Blaker	9269-4	6250

20792 7590 10/05/2005

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER

CALLAHAN, PAUL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/852,562

Applicant(s)

BLAKER ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Callahan

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-29, 33-45, 49-58, 61-73 and 77-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-20, 25-29, 33-45, 49, 55-58, 61-73, 77, 81-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21-24, 50-53 and 78-81 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-86 were pending at the time of the previous office Action. Claims 1-3, 17-19, 30-32, 46-48, 59, 60, and 74-76 have been cancelled via the latest amendment. Claims 4-16, 20-29, 33-45, 48-58, 61-73, and 77-86 remain pending in the application and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7-11-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues in traverse of the rejection, as found in the previous Office Action, of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious in view of Hocevar '788 and further in view of Chi '489. The argument presented is based on the assertion that Chi fails to teach the feature of "...notifying a host processor that a command block has been executed by updating a completion field in the command block using the cryptoprocessor..." Yet a careful reading of Chi reveals that such a feature is indeed taught at the passages cited in the rejection of the claim. In col. 7 line 59 through col. 8 line 5 a "PBB" response block is updated once a process is terminated. This is further illustrated in col. 8 lines 42-50. This updating is carried out by a cryptoprocessor as is shown in, for example, col. 2 lines 16-20 where the "PIE" processor is shown to be carrying out cryptographic operations.

The applicant argues in traverse of the rejection, as found in the previous Office Action, of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Hussain '456. The argument presented is based on the assertion that Hussain fails to teach the feature of "...invoking an interrupt using a cryptoprocessor after executing a command block if the interrupt field in the command block is set to the value to request the interrupt." Yet a careful reading of Hussain shows that such is indeed taught at the passages cited in the rejection; in col. 6 line 59 through col. 7 line 6; where a rendering engine is able to interrupt a host processor using sent values of a "ready variable".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 4, 33, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocevar et al., EP 0 945 788 A2, in view of Chi et al., US 5,706,489.

As for claim 4, the claim has been amended by the latest amendment to include the language found in claim 11 of "notifying the host processor that the command block has been executed by updating a completion field in the command block using the cryptographic processor." This limitation is not taught by Hocevar. The remainder of claim 4 is unchanged by the latest amendment, and therefore the balance of the limitations are taught by Hocevar at the passages detailed in the previous Office Action

Art Unit: 2137

in the case. The added limitation however, is taught by Chi at col. 7 line 59 through col. 8 line 5, and at col. 8 line 42-50. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this limitation into the system of Hocevar. The motive to make this combination is discussed for example, at Hocevar col. 1 lines 35-45 where the advantageous added efficiency of such co-processor signaling is discussed.

As for claim 33, the claim has been amended by the latest amendment to include similar language to that found in claim 40 of "the means for notifying comprising means for updating a completion field in the command block using the cryptographic processor." Hocevar does not teach this limitation. The remainder of claim 33 is unchanged by the latest amendment, and therefore the balance of the limitations are taught by Hocevar at the passages detailed in the previous Office Action in the case. The added limitation however, is taught by Chi at col. 7 line 59 through col. 8 line 5, and at col. 8 line 42-50. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this limitation into the system of Hocevar. The motive to make this combination is discussed for example, at Hocevar col. 1 lines 35-45 where the advantageous added efficiency of such co-processor signaling is discussed.

As for claim 61, the claim has been amended by the latest amendment to include the language found in claim 68 of "the computer readable program code for notifying

Art Unit: 2137

comprising computer readable program code for updating a completion field in the command block using the cryptographic processor." Hocevar does not teach this limitation. The remainder of claim 61 is unchanged by the latest amendment, and therefore the balance of the limitations are taught by Hocevar as noted in the previous Office Action in the case. The added limitation however, is taught by Chi at col. 7 line 59 through col. 8 line 5, and at col. 8 line 42-50. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this limitation into the system of Hocevar. The motive to make this combination is discussed, for example, at Hocevar col. 1 lines 35-45 where the advantageous added efficiency of such co-processor signaling is discussed.

5. Claims 5-16, 20-29, 34-45, 48-58, 62-73, and 77-86 have not been changed by the latest amendment. Therefore no change to the language of the rejections is necessary. The rejections of these claims will not be repeated herein, but instead are incorporated in their entirety by reference to the previous Office Action in the case. The Applicant is referred to the previous Office Action for the text of these rejections.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 09/852,562 *pc*
Art Unit: 2137

Page 6

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

9/30/05

Paul Callahan

Emmanuel Moise
EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER